

Reserve Forces Policy Board Meeting Minutes
Annual Meeting - March 22, 2011
Fort Myer Officer's Club, VA – Koran Ballroom

Members Present (See Attached)
Member Representatives (See Attached)
Invited Guests (See Attached)
RFPB Staff Present (See Attached)

OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE ANNUAL MEETING:

Lt Col Small, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), opened the March 22nd, 2011 meeting at 8:01 AM and welcomed the Reserve Forces Policy Chairman, Board, alumni and distinguished visitors. The DFO presented an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) opening meeting rules. Lt Col Small introduces Maj Gen James N. Stewart, Military Executive, Reserve Forces Policy Board.

WELCOME, ADMINISTRATIVE REMARKS, AND INTRODUCTIONS:

Maj Gen James N. Stewart, Military Executive, Reserve Forces Policy Board, presents:

- Administrative remarks - safety, building evacuation, cell phone usage, question/answer protocols, restroom locations, and staff assistance - as needed
- Reviewed the Reserve Forces Policy Board (Board) Agenda
- Addressed attendees for any questions or concerns
- Introduced William S. Greenberg, Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board

RFPB CHAIRMAN WILLIAM S. GREENBERG WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS:

Chairman Greenberg welcomed the Board members and distinguished alumni members and guests. He provided historical perspectives in reference to advisory boards. One of Chairman Greenberg's personal objectives is to make the Board something a service member wants to serve on sometime during their career. He was extremely proud to see the Alumni in attendance at the meeting.

Chairman Greenberg hailed the arrival of Maj Gen Stewart as one of the Board's big achievements for the year. Maj Gen Stewart is a full-time Air Force Reserve two-star general officer who has accomplished much since his February 2011 report date. Chairman Greenberg also articulated that another Board objective is to permanently move the entire RFPB staff to the Pentagon. In addition, he reminded members that the Board membership transitions from 24 to 20 members on 1 July 11.

Chairman Greenberg wanted to address several specific issues during the annual meeting such as the Board configuration and its future, as well as other issues and recommendations. He believes that the RFPB should be the first place the Secretary of Defense turns to for answers on Reserve issues. A great deal of experience, knowledge, and understanding of service member needs should come from Boards like the RFPB.

Chairman Greenberg proposed two discussion topics to the Board:

- Move the RFPB 2011 Annual Report closeout from September 30, 2011 to August 31, 2011
- Conduct an in-depth review of the history of the RFPB spanning the past 60 years

He also urged Board members to bring issues that they felt needed brought to the table to be captured in the next annual report. Additionally, Chairman Greenberg mentioned that he was invited to speak at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton by faculty and business executives. The topic discussed was the *Future of*

the Volunteer Force. It was a speech well received by civilians who were not well versed on the concept. Finally, Chairman Greenberg:

- Spoke about the *Reserve Forces Policy Board Citizen Patriot Award* presentations given to:
 - Former Senator Robert Dole, R-Kansas
 - Senator John McCain, R-Arizona
- Encouraged everyone to participate: Board, distinguished visitors, and alumni
- Hailed: Maj Gen James N. Stewart, RFPB Military Executive
- Bid Farewell to Board members:
 - Maj Gen T. C. Coon, USAFR
 - RADM Jeffrey A. Lemmons, USNR

FIRST GUEST SPEAKER:

- **Honorable Dennis M. McCarthy, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs**

GUEST SPEAKER:

- Remarks set the stage for discussion of pertinent issues
- Described where the reserve community is right now
 - In transition; the percentage of reserve forces in combat have decreased
- Challenged Board to shape future of reserve components rather than having outside influences shape them for us
- Invited questions/comments from the audience

QUESTION: Maj Gen TC Coon, USAFR, Board Member:

- “Who is involved in vetting the opinions/comments on the “Comprehensive Review” report for Sec Def review?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- OSD RA conducted an extensive review of Reserve Component (R/C) involvement with the Active Components (A/C)
- This review was truly comprehensive and conducted with a broad scope
- Every significant office in DoD, services, and the combatant commands were represented. The review was dominated by A/C and combatant commanders. One thing that was decided, although every effort was made to find common ground, is that dissenting opinions were placed in an annex.
- Once comments were compiled, distributed, and circulated, the final draft (#24) resulted in 24 different responses - 23 concurs and 1 non-concur. Dr Stanley, USD (P&R), determined that the report would be submitted to the Secretary of Defense with the responses intact.

QUESTION: MG Charles Luckey, JCS Representative:

- “With current pressures of the budget, how do we maintain the train, mobilize, deploy model?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- Clearly there is a shift in the fundamental reserve component
- We have funded our activities for the past 10 years with supplemental funds
- Now faced with service budgets competing for limited funding and looking for savings
- All costs are now driven to baseline

QUESTION: RADM Steven Day, USCGR, Board Member:

- “TSP and Tricare reserve select are awesome; however, I’d like to ask about travel reimbursement for IDT. A few years ago it was authorized but not funded. Since it is a lean time right now, is there any chance at all for IDT travel?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- The Quadrennial Review for Military Compensation (QRMC) is underway
- I am a glass half full type guy, and I think the effort this year, led by Mr. Tom Bush, has more potential for groundbreaking change than I have seen for awhile. What you will see is a fundamental shift in the way we compensate reserve components members. The way ahead will be much more like active component compensation.
- The programmers think this could create an opportunity to break out more money for IDT travel. Is it considered important enough? Is it universal? I suspect no, but it will provide an opportunity to be used more broadly.
- The RFPB could influence the future of this issue, if you come with a series of recommendations
- QRMC has great ideas for R/C compensation for UTA, IDT, and retirement pay

QUESTION: Maj Gen Anita Gallentine, USAFR, Board Member:

- “With a declining budget, do you see the level of deploying R/C members going down?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- Need a balanced approach to equipment capitalization but still have money for operations
- Focusing only on equipment capitalization and not sending R/C members to the field - a huge disservice
- Each member signed up/reenlisted after 9/11 to be in the reserves to serve. They want to continue to be used and to contribute. If we deprive them of this because of equipment capitalization, we will go back to a strategic reserve; this would not be a good idea.
- We clearly need equipment capitalization, but we must do it smartly
- Pools of equipment drawn on for training and deployment means shared equipment
- There will never be enough money for 100% equipment capitalization and deployment of our members
- Need to look at the budget costs associated with deploying our members on a rotational deployment
- This is going to cost the A/C; how much money are they willing to spend?
- We are going to have to figure out how to balance that need with a better strategy
- What we put in the barn needs to be front line equipment not old stuff; buy less stuff, but the best!

QUESTION: BrigGen James Lariviere, USMCR, Board Member:

- “In the past we have discussed accessibility of a force?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- Combatant commanders need reliability; to know R/C members will be there in time of need
- We have recommended that the current presidential recall process be changed; that there are times when the POTUS does not need to declare an emergency call-up to get access to R/C forces. The POTUS should be able to use no more than 200,000 reserve component members for domestic, national security situations.
- Requires a change to 10 USC 12304, allowing the POTUS to utilize the R/C in a domestic crisis

QUESTION: A distinguished visitor:

- “What are you hearing in terms of employer support?”

RESPONSE: Honorable McCarthy stated:

- I was on active duty October 1, 2001 when we started partial mobilization
 - If you would have told me ten years later that employers would still be as supportive as they are now, I would have been so sure.
 - Our employers have been remarkable, and I don’t see any change in that!

- There are very few employers breaking the law and I don't see a dramatic shift in this situation
 - Overall, employer support is tremendous
- Employers are calling in reference to disabled veterans, and asking how they can take care of them
 - Clear challenge for the future
- Unfortunately, the number of commanders reaching out to our employers is very small...this situation needs to change
 - Commanders need to reach out to their members' employers
 - Please let them know the importance of sustaining employer support
 - It is becoming increasingly important!

2nd SPEAKER: (SLIDES)

- **Maj Gen James Stewart, Military Executive, Reserve Forces Policy Board**
- Topic - 2011 NDAA, Sec. 514. Revision of the Structure and Functions of the RFPB

Maj Gen Stewart discussed:

- Importance of maintaining operability and connectivity with other boards
- RFPB will look at the services and their various programs
 - Policy committee issues and concerns
 - Partnerships, conferences, working groups, studies, and internship opportunities

GUEST SPEAKERS: (SLIDES)

- **Maj Gen Brian P. Meenan, MA to the Chief of Staff of the USAF**
Air Reserve Forces Policy Committee (ARFPC) – Chairman
 - Update on AF Issues
- **MG Errol R. Schwartz, Commanding General, Joint Force Headquarters, DC National Guard**
Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee (ARFPC) – Deputy Chairman
 - Update on Army Issues
- **RDML Paula C. Brown, Deputy Commander, First Naval Construction Division, USN**
National Navy Reserve Policy Board (NNRPD)
 - “Joint” Issues Overview”
- **MajGen John M. Croley, Deputy Commander, USMC Forces Command; and Commander USMC Forces South,**
Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board (MCRPB)
 - “ MCRPB 10-11 Update”
- **CDR Annette M. Tomkins, CG-131, Reserve Policy & Plans Division**
Coast Guard Reserve Policy Committee (CGRPC)
 - “ Ready Today- Preparing for Tomorrow”

AIR FORCE/ARMY/NAVY/MARINE/COAST GUARD RESERVE POLICY BOARDS

“Panel Crosswalk”

Chairman Greenberg opened the discussion by asking our guests what Company Grade Officer and enlisted personnel feel are the most important issues facing them. The discussion included pay, time away from civilian employers, deployments, mobilizations, and outreach to employers.

RDML Paula C. Brown addressed the following:

- Force structure and the significant changes projected for the future
- Young Sailors are being asked to leave due to a reduction in overall numbers; hurts them because of pride in their service and the current economic conditions
- Predictability of future missions - telling employers and family on short notice that deployment is required is hard on both

Maj Gen Brian P. Meenan addressed the following:

- Airmen want to know that their families are being taken care of while they are deployed
- Stability and predictability of mission sets is essential
- Dealing with new fiscal realities is going to be demanding - we are going to be challenged.
 - Affects members who are on long term MPA days
 - Affects members on 1095 waivers

CDR Annette M. Tomkins addressed the following:

- Rapid Mobilization occurs all too frequently and it seems that Processing Center personnel are not ready for our Reservists
- Family and employment issues
- Employers are not happy with unpredictable future...they want advance notice

MajGen Daryl Moore addressed the following:

- Reservists are challenged: competing institutional needs vs. personal needs
- CGO officers coming off of A/D are looking for Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) positions instead of leading marines

QUESTION: Chairman Greenberg asked panel members whether the concept of “jointness” should be abolished...haven’t we achieved the objective in this area?

RADM Steven Day comments:

- As a commander, he is a strong proponent of “jointness”
- Should be one part of a very diverse career

Maj Gen TC Coon comments:

- Achieving joint qualification for traditional Reservists is difficult
- Get the right folks joint experience to build future leaders...not everyone needs to be joint qualified

MG Glenn Reith comments:

- Joint qualification necessary when working with interagencies
- The whole joint process is overcome by bureaucracy
- Need Joint qualification to become a General Officer
- No bench if leadership does not look at civilian skill sets when picking future leaders
- Family Support essential
- Reservists are asking - Will I have a job when I come home? Will my company support me?

MG Charles Luckey comments:

- Need to find other avenues to get our future leaders their Joint Professional Military Education (JPME).
- Requirement to have JPME in order to become a General Officer by 2015 is inaccurate

Mrs. Cherie Emerson comments:

- Predictability and Sustainability are important to our Reservists
- Communication efforts necessary to keep Reservists and families informed
- Employer Partnership Programs help spread the word

MG Errol R. Schwartz comments:

- Members are coming home and going back to employers with medical issues
- Employers don't want to hire reservists with medical issues

MajGen James L. Williams (Ret) comments:

- In the continuum of service/care, he had concerns about service members coming back from deployments having difficulty getting jobs in federal service
-

Maj Gen Brian P. Meenan comments:

- The A/C end strength numbers are high so many of their members are leaving and choosing to join the reserve/guard
 - However, some are forced to pay back portions of their incentive bonuses, which serves as a disincentive to join the reserve component

Maj Gen James Stewart comments:

- Continuum of Service – important topic for next RFPB meeting

Honorable Terry O'Connell comments:

- Joint training important to all our services; it's a necessity to have the R/C participating in the joint world
- All issues discussed today tie into basic concept of Utilization vs. Integration
- Questioned panel members on whether there was any cross talk among the various service branches in reference to this basic concept

Maj Gen Brian P. Meenan comments:

- There is no current meeting schedule that brings the service components together, but in the last couple of months, the Army invited the AF to join them in discussions on mutual areas of concern
- MG Schwartz states that the Army staff meets regularly to discuss issues – this is a great idea
- Maj Gen Stewart commented that interface with all components is an objective of the RFPB
- RDML Brown commented that the Navy interacts with their Marine counterparts, but not with the Army or Air Force

QUESTION: Mr. Robert Green, a distinguished guest, addressed Maj Gen Meenan and asked

- Has the transition of our reserve force to an "operational reserve" improved our relationship with our active duty partners?

Response: Maj Gen Meenan replied: Yes! Relationships with reservists are more common, and substantive crosstalk moving in a better direction

Chairman Greenberg makes closing remarks and RFPB moves to next event

WORKING LUNCH: (SLIDES AND HANDOUTS)

Maj Gen James N. Stewart Introductions:

Dr. Mary M. Keller, MCEC, Chief Executive Officer Military Child Education Coalition (MCEC)

Mrs. Patricia Shinseki, MCEC Board Member

MG Paul Mock, USAR (Ret) - MCEC Representative

Presentation given on the function/role of MCEC and what it does for military families

QUESTION: Maj Gen James Stewart asks, “Does MCEC interface/interact with the OSD Yellow Ribbon Program?”

Response: Dr. Keller states, we would love to work with them, but must be invited first”

Response: Maj Gen Stewart replies, “I’ll get you an invitation.”

GUEST SPEAKER:

- **Mr. Robert Smiley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Readiness, Training, and Mobilization, OSD RA**
 - Comprehensive Review of the Future Role of the RC

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

- Rebalancing the force
- Law and policy changes
- One Law: Mobilization Policy: 1095 waivers
- Combatant Commanders have positive feedback in reference to rotational R/C forces
- Parity/Pay/Retirement is not looked at in the report
- One pay/personnel system
- Linkages to the Commission on National guard and Reserves Report recommendations
- Concern the report does not speak to the culture of Reserve Component and dealing with “associated” units
- Historical difficulties of A/C and R/C not working together and now being combined into units

Chairman Greenberg question:

- Discussed the lack of improvement with the health of reserve components and follow-on care for their members.

Mr. Smiley answer: OSD/RA will need to dig a little further to confirm the information/assertion.

Chairman’s Comments

- Reviewed the 2011 Annual Report progress
- Asked the Board, “Do you think we should make specific recommendations to SECDEF based upon your own Service conditions or does it depend on the issue?”

MG Jeffrey Talley comments:

- Biggest Army Reserve issue is getting in on the debate with respect to funding

- It's important to all services but specifically to the Army
- How do you implement the "Operational Force" concept with no funding?
- The next 4-6 months will be the most important faced by the Army in the last 50 years
- Anything we can do to collectively weigh- in on the funding issue is extremely important

Maj Gen Stewart comment:

- Recommends consideration of SECDEF Gate's "Track Four Efficiency Initiatives Decisions" affect on Service funding issues in future reality of limited dollars

Mrs. Cherie Emerson comments:

- Points out that Army is looking at options to traditional 39-day participation model
- Wants to ensure accessibility to the reserve, but also have the funding to pay for them- funding will be the driver

Chairman Greenberg comments:

- If funding is the driving issue, then how does the RFPB approach it?
- Congress frequently wants to spend more money than the military does
- Are there concrete proposals we would like to identify/propose to the SECDEF?
- I thought the Goldwater-Nichols Act was to simplify the chain of command!

Honorable Terry O' Connell comments:

- There will not be much change in the 2012 budget...we're still operating under a continuing resolution (CR)
- Significant cuts are coming in the 2013 budget
- Time to look at other options to propose to SECDEF
- Purpose of the Board is provide guidance to SECDEF and be helpful to Congress
- RFPB discussion needs focused on most cost effective ways to do business
- Reserves need to figure out how to bring the capability to the table in more cost effective ways

BrigGen James Lariviere comments:

- The concern most frequently mentioned by A/C members is the "Operational Reserve" is more expensive once mobilized
- If we stay as a strategic component, we are cheaper...suggested that dollars drives the argument
- We need further discussion on the "Operational Reserve" concept

Chairman Greenberg comments:

- Need Service components of the R/C to make the argument of why it's better to have an "Operational Reserve" rather than an a "Strategic Reserve"
- Pull together existing studies and reports instead of reinventing the wheel
- Analyze data, and then pull information together to make valid recommendations.

Maj Gen James N. Stewart recommends to the Chairman:

- Form a subcommittee to conduct the study - should be taken as an action item
- The subcommittee should review R/C reports and various studies to develop a solidified plan addressing the "Operational Reserve" capabilities to then present to SECDEF

Maj Gen Anita Gallentine comment:

- Use our reserve/guard students at senior service schools to do these studies

Honorable Terry O’Connell comment:

- Action needs to happen now - “Super Rush” - because you are behind the staff and members of Congress who are writing the rules now

Chairman Greenberg comments:

- Should we go into subcommittee mode or do we feel comfortable enough to take on this task on our own?

Honorable Terry O’Connell comments:

- Recommends quick action...“if we can put something together in 90 days we may have a chance to influence the debate.”
- The “Operational Reserve” is masking the underlining problem which is the A/C is too small, which causes the A/C to rely more on their reserve components
- Only reason we are currently an “Operational Reserve” is due to supplemental funding (Overseas Contingency Operations or OCO funds)
- Supplemental funding is probably going to go away in 2013
 - Without supplemental funding there is less money, resulting in a smaller force structure
 - Requirements will need to go down or we prioritize those requirements and fund what we can
- A missing component in the discussion may be the RFPB alumni members, who have connectivity to Capitol Hill...use their influence as a strategy to implement the “Operational Reserve” concept

Chairman Greenberg comments:

- Suggests Board members tap their brains for thoughts and ideas on what/how we want to present our “Operational Reserve” concept to SECDEF
- Analyze time and resources that we have available right now
- Should the RFPB be a player in the budgetary process? If so, which year do we want to target for implementing our concept

Maj Gen TC Coon comments:

- We can choose to take all the various reports and debate the issues or we can simplify our lives by going after the 80% solution...analyze Mr. Smiley’s report or any other report and then identify the issues through consensus

Chairman Greenberg suggests:

- Board examine Mr. Smiley’s discussion points and then present recommendations in a three-five paragraph synopsis to SECDEF
- The most useful thing we could say right now is that we have the most trained and equipped R/C right now and the risk of losing it due to budget cuts is ill advised – if the board agrees
- SECDEF needs to analyze cost effective ways to utilize the R/C
- RFPB needs to provide a valid argument to prove the R/C is more cost effective/valuable as an operational force

Maj Gen James Stewart comment:

- Service components have not agreed to a standardized cost analysis process to compare/contrast capabilities of R/C compared to A/C. Until agreed upon criteria is established, a fair comparison cannot be made

Chairman Greenberg comment:

- First objective is to have sufficient access to train and equip the reservist with an appropriate budget

- Discussed options to analyze all of the reports for presentation to SECDEF

Maj Gen Anita Gallentine comment:

- Reemphasized her earlier point of engaging reserve students in senior service schools to analyze and chart out all the reserve component reports for study

Maj Gen James Stewart comment:

- Thanks the RFPB alumni for attending and participating and stated the RFPB staff will continue to build and support the alumni network to keep them actively engaged

Chairman Greenberg closed the meeting at 3:41 PM.

SIGNED:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William S. Greenberg", with a stylized flourish at the end.

WILLIAM S. GREENBERG
Chairman